

Appln No.: 09/681,691
Amendment Dated: June 27, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 5, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed April 5, 2005 for the above-captioned application. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

It is noted by the undersigned that the Examiner makes mention of "Applicant's arguments filed on 12/07/2004", throughout the current Office Action. Applicant assumes that the Examiner meant the arguments filed on August 4, 2004.

Claims 1-3

On page 5 of the current Office Action, the Examiner responded to Applicant's arguments filed on August 4, 2004 by stating that:

the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "rearranging loops to give rise to doubled bandwidth" in the last paragraph of page 8 of the Arguments) are not recited in the rejected claim(s).

Applicant has now amended Claim 1 to include specific reference to the resultant doubled bandwidth that occurs when the devices are divided into two split loops. For convenience, amended Claim 1 is printed below.

1. (Amended) An enclosure services processor card arranged to selectively split a fibre-channel arbitrated-loop (FC-AL) of devices into two split loops,

said card being adapted to plug into a backplane for a rack enclosure and including a first switch operatively connected to a hub for said FC-AL,

Appln No.: 09/681,691
Amendment Dated: June 27, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 5, 2005

said hub comprising a plurality of port bypass circuits,

each port bypass circuit being connected to a pair of tracks which in use connect to a respective one of each of said devices comprising said fibre channel arbitrated loop,

said hub further comprising second and third switches operatively controlled by said first switch,

said second and third switches being disposed between respective port bypass circuits at which said loop is to be split so that in a first state said second and third switches connect said devices in a single loop and in a second state said second and third switches divide said devices into two split loops,

said single loop of the first state having a first bandwidth,

said two split loops of the second state having a second bandwidth, said second bandwidth being twice that of the first bandwidth.

No new matter has been added.

Applicant also repeats the arguments provided in the August 8, 2004 Office Action response with respect to Claim 1.

Reconsideration of Claim 1 is requested.

Claims 2-3 are dependent on Claim 1. If Claim 1 is allowable, then Claims 2-3 should also be

Appln No.: 09/681,691
Amendment Dated: June 27, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 5, 2005

allowed. Reconsideration of Claims 2-3 are requested.

Claims 4-6

Claims 4-6 are allowed.

Claim 7

Claim 7 is dependent on Claim 1. If Claim 1 is allowable, then Claim 7 should also be allowed.
Reconsideration of Claim 7 is requested.

Claims 8-10

Claims 8-10 are dependent on Claim 1. If Claim 1 is allowable, then Claims 8-10 should also be allowed.
Reconsideration of Claims 8-10 is requested.

Claim 11

Claim 11 is a new claim. This claim is identical the text of Claim 1 prior to the current amendment with the exception of an additional final line which states:

whereby dividing said devices into two split loops gives rise to a bandwidth double that of the devices connected in single loop.

This line was added in response to the Examiner's "Response to Arguments" provided in the current Office Action. No new matter has been added.

Appln No.: 09/681,691
Amendment Dated: June 27, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 5, 2005

Examination of Claim 11 is respectfully requested.

Claims 12-17

Claims 12-17 are new claims which depend on Claim 11. If Claim 11 is allowable, then Claims 12-17 should also be allowed.

Examination of Claims 12-17 is respectfully requested.

Claims 18-21

Claims 18-21 are method claims which essentially track apparatus Claim 1. No new matter has been added and no further searching should be required of the Examiner in the examination of these claims.

Examination of Claims 18-21 is respectfully requested.

For these reasons, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Carl Oppedahl
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32746
(970) 468-6600

Page 13 of 13